

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
April 19, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on April 19, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. Meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Flip chart notes taken during the meeting are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – March 22, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the March 22, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from the March 22, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Action Item #R17: | Presentation to the Work Group on Riverbend Park. |
| Status: | A presentation regarding Riverbend Park is included in this agenda. |
| Action Item #R18: | Consulting Team will revise issue statements and distribute them to the Work Group prior to their next meeting. |
| Status: | A Discussion of the revised issue statements is included in this agenda. |
| Action Item #R19: | State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) to be deposited in document repository. |
| Status: | The SCORP will be placed in the information repository within three weeks. Status will be reported back to the Work Group at their next meeting. |

Interim Projects Task Force Report

Riverbend Project

Bob Sharkey of the Feather River Recreation and Parks District provided the Work Group with a brief overview of the West Park/Riverbend project. The project had been proposed as an interim project by the Interim Projects Task Force. In the prior Work Group meeting it was requested that proponents of the project present information at the next Work Group meeting regarding the project being considered by the Interim Projects Task Force. Mike Pierce, Scott Lawrence, Joe Spada, Lonnie Steadman, Bob Sharkey, Jim Ragland, Jeff Zeisdorf, and Sonny Brandt made the presentation to the Work Group. They explained the history of the project, where it fits within the vision of park development in the community, the funds that had been set aside to date for development, and the potential impact the project could have on the region. Written information was provided to the Work Group regarding the West Park/Riverbend project, and is appended to this summary as attachment 4.

- One participant wanted to know what provisions had been made in the plan for periodic flooding at the park site. Bob Sharkey explained that there were a variety of techniques that could be used to secure soil and vegetation on the site during flood flows. He added that a vegetation management line item was included in one of the proposed interim projects.
- One participant asked about apparent inconsistencies in the description of the project boundary between several of the proposed interim projects. The participant added that it appeared that

the descriptions provided in the packet were different from those considered by the Task Force. Bob Sharkey responded that the proposals for the various interim projects were still being developed and they would be coordinated for consistency prior to their approval.

- The Work Group discussed the process for approving the interim projects associated with the West Park/Riverbend project. Several participants were under the impression that the Interim Task Force had approved the project and moved it to the Work Group for their approval. Dale Hoffman-Floerke of DWR explained that the presentation was not a prelude to a vote for approval. She added that DWR views this project favorably, but that each proposed interim project needed to be judged against the criteria established by the Task Force. She mentioned that the Task Force had not done this yet, and that by Work Group agreement it would not be possible to recommend to the Work Group any project until that happened. She added that DWR was not obligated to approve projects prior to the new license. DWR has agreed with the community that some projects could be pursued through an Interim Projects Task Force. She stressed that the process set up by the Task Force should be followed in order to assure that all interim projects are considered equitably.

Andy Atkinson of the Department of Fish and Game reported on a recent work stoppage at the West Park/Riverbend Project. He explained that work being done at the site was covered under an MOU between the State and the Feather River Recreation and Parks District. DFG wardens on the site had determined some of the work was proceeding counter to the terms and conditions established in the MOU. Work at the site was stopped until the situation could be worked out. The issue was resolved in 24 hours and work at the site has resumed.

Review Revised Scoping Statements

The Facilitator explained that scoping Issue Statements are part of the NEPA process. The relicensing process has elicited comments or issues from the stakeholders in various forums. This Work Group is interested in identifying those comments or issues that have relevance to Recreation and Socioeconomics. The Work Group task is to summarize these into Issues Statements. An Issue Statement represents a number of issues/comments that have a common theme. In the NEPA process the applicant tries to identify all the issues that might need to be addressed for a specific project. The issues identified are presented to the public in a scoping document. These issues will also determine the extent and types of studies that are conducted. The public can add issues or suggest changes to issues identified in the document. She added that the Issue Statements are based on specific issues/comments but should remain somewhat broad to accommodate for the broad range of issues that may be presented by the public.

At their previous meeting, the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group provided comment on draft Issue Statements developed by the consulting team. At the conclusion of that meeting, the Work Group agreed to have the consulting team continue with further revisions to the Issues Statements to capture the group's thoughts. Revised Issue Statements were distributed to the Work Group and are appended to this summary as Appendix 5.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group provided the following changes.

RECREATION

- R1:** Adequacy of existing project recreation facilities, opportunities, and access to accommodate current use and future demand.
- R2:** Adequacy of public safety at the Oroville Project recreation facilities.
- R3:** Effects of facilities operations on recreation and socioeconomic opportunities.
- R4:** Adequacy of maintenance and clean-up activities associated with recreation areas.

- R5:** Appropriate recreation funding, development, and management structure.
- R6:** Appropriate management of fisheries and wildlife resources to provide recreational opportunities.

SOCIOECONOMICS

- S1:** Improve economic development through recreation-opportunities at the Oroville Facilities.
- S2:** Assess the feasibility of economic development through lower local utility rates and/or other available economic options related to project resources.
- The Work Group discussed how individual issues/comments could be tracked within the Issue Statements. Some participants feared that it would be difficult to track individual issues/comments as the statements were developed. The Facilitator responded that Scoping Document I would include as an appendix individual issues/comments that have been identified throughout the process. The consultants agreed to annotate the statements to the issues for tracking.
 - One participant wanted to know if these were long-term goals since interim projects were mentioned. The Facilitator responded that interim projects were included in the long-term goals so they would not be lost.
 - The Work Group agreed to send the revised Issue Statements on to the Plenary Group for their review and inclusion in Scoping Document I.

Review Resource Goal Statements

At their previous meeting, the Work Group tasked the consulting team with developing draft resource goals for each Issue Statement. This would be a prelude to developing full Issue Sheets. The Issues Statements and draft resource goals were distributed to the Work Group and are appended to this summary as Appendix 6.

The Facilitator reviewed the structure of the Issue Sheets (issue statement, geographic scope, resource goal, existing information, and needed information) and the development of resource goals. She added that at their last meeting, the Environmental Work Group moved the identification of geographic scope of the issue before the identification of resources. The Environmental Work Group also decided to develop a Task Force of FWS, DWR and the consultant team to write a draft process for developing Issue Sheets.

The Work Group agreed to review the Issue Statements and draft resource goals and provide input to the consulting team by May 10, 2001. The revised Issue Statement and draft resource goals would be reviewed at the next meeting. The consulting team agreed to provide the Work Group with an electronic version of the handout.

Next Meeting

The Work Group agreed to meet on Thursday, May 24, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM at the Oro Health Club.

Agreements Made

1. The Work Group agreed to review revisions to the approved Issue Statements and draft resource goals developed by the consulting team at their next meeting. They agreed to provide input to the consulting team by May 10, 2001.
2. The Work Group agreed to send the revised Issue Statements to the Plenary Group for incorporation into Scoping Document I.

3. The Work Group agreed to meet again on May 24, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM at the Oro Health Club.

Homework

The Work Group agreed to review revisions to the approved Issue Statements and draft resource goals developed by the consulting team at their next meeting. They agreed to provide input to the consulting team by May 10, 2001.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R20: Graphic explaining Issue Statement and issue sheet development.

Responsible: Consulting Team

Due Date: May 24, 2001

Action Item #R21: Electronic version of the Issue Statements and resource goals will be distributed to the Work Group via e-mail for review and comment at the next meeting. Comments back to the consulting team by 5-10-01 will be included in review version.

Responsible: Consulting Team

Due Date: May 1, 2001